



**Motion 6:** Adopt tentative commercial and recreational alternatives for the area from the OR/CA border to the U.S./Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report.

Moved by: Marci Yaremko                      Seconded by: David Crabbe  
Motion 6 carried unanimously.

**Motion 7:** Council moves forward with:

- the consideration of restructuring of the stock complex assemblages and to provide additional analysis in June to consider of a preliminary preferred alternative at that time
  - In June, see the bar graphs for OFL component contribution compared to recent levels of removals
  - Include options for how to manage species that are removed from complexes
- In addition approve the GMT recommendations of items 1-4 on page 6 of Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT report which retains the range of alternatives found in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 1.
- Task the Council Staff to evaluate a June/September and June/September/November process.
- Prioritize the other Fish and Slope rockfish complexes as a top priority, and other stock complexes as a lower priority
- Include anticipated costs compared with status quo. Group alternatives of high priority together in cost analysis.
- Include incorporating concepts in GMT statement pages 3 & 4 (Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT Report); background goals and purpose & need.
- Request the SSC discuss priorities for improvements in data quality; relative to sampling data
- Add the GAP Alternative for Nearshore rockfish.
- Explore the use of WCGOP and NMFS Trawl survey to evaluate catch ratios.

Moved by: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln  
Motion 7 carried unanimously.

**Motion 8:** Adopt the recommendations for set-asides of 2,500 mt to accommodate for Pacific whiting mortality in research and pink shrimp fisheries; as shown in Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report.

Moved by: Gway Kirchner                      Seconded by: Jeff Feldner  
Motion 8 carried unanimously.

**Motion 9:** Adopt the letter in Agenda Item F.1.a Attachment 1: Council Letter to the Department of the Interior; and direct Council staff to adjust the language to a more “positive tone.”

Moved by: Marci Yaremko                      Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine  
Motion 9 carried unanimously.

**Motion 10:** Approve the revised discard mortality rates for cowcod, canary, and yelloweye rockfish as shown in Agenda Item D.5.b, ~~Supplemental~~-GMT Report, Table 7 on Page 14 with the 90 percent confidence interval as shown in that table; except for the depth bin for “greater than 50 fathoms,” change to “50-100 fathoms” and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent.

Moved by: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

**Amndmnt 1:** Strike the following wording in the motion: “Except for the depth bin for greater than 50 fathoms, change to 50-100 fathoms and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent.”

Moved By: Dan Wolford                      Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine  
Amendment 1 failed (Ms Kirchner, Mr. Myer, Ms. Culver, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Sones, Mr. Ortmann, Mr. Lincoln, and Mr. Lockhart voted no).

**Amndmnt 2:** Replace 90 percent in the 50 fathom depth bin with a 75 percent confidence interval.

Moved By: Dan Wolford                      Seconded by: David Crabbe  
Amendment 2 failed (Mr. Ortmann, Mr. Lockhart, Ms. Culver, Ms. Kirchner, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Sones voted no).  
Motion 10 carried unanimously.

**Motion 11:** Council to direct NMFS NWFSC to finish the Synthesis Report, taking into account the recommendation by the EFHRC in paragraph 1a, b, and c (Page 1 of Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental EFHRC Report) and consider any advice received from the SSC after their review of the Appendix. This Synthesis Report and future SSC comments will be made available on the Council’s website.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart                      Seconded by: Herb Pollard  
Motion 11 carried unanimously.

**Motion 12:** Adopt the RFP in Agenda Item D.6.a, Attachment 1 (Request for Proposals to Modify Pacific Coast Groundfish EHF reflecting changes made at the 9/2012 PFMC Meeting 9/25/2012); and release the RFP initiating Phase II of the five-year review process.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln  
Motion 12 carried unanimously.

**Motion 13:** Council request that the completed Synthesis Report, and any other information, should be made publically available and the RFP issued by May 1, and that all proposals are submitted to the Council by July 31.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln  
Motion 13 carried unanimously.

**Motion 14:** Adopt the amended suite of alternatives contained in Agenda Item E.3.b, Supplemental NMFS Report 2, including changes as reflected from the September 2012 Council Meeting, and including new alternatives 2A, 2B, and 6E.

Moved by: Bob Turner                              Seconded by: Phil Anderson  
Motion 14 carried unanimously.

**Motion 15:** Adopt the recommendations of the SAS contained in Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental SAS Report dated April 2013, as the final incidental halibut landing restriction recommendations for the 2013 commercial salmon troll fisheries.

Moved by: Steve Williams                      Seconded by: Phil Anderson

**Amndmnt 1:** Strike “2013” and insert “beginning May 1, 2013 through April 30, 2014.”

Moved By: Phil Anderson                      Seconded by: Jeff Feldner  
Amendment 1 carried unanimously.      Motion 15, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 16:** Adopt Option 1 in Agenda Item G.1, Situation Summary, as final recommendations for 2013 landing limits on halibut harvest in the fixed gear primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis which reads: Beginning May 1, restrict incidental halibut possession and landings to 75 lbs (dressed weight) of halibut for every 1,000 lbs (dressed weight) of sablefish landed and up to two additional halibut may be possessed or landed in excess of the 75 lbs per 1,000 lb ratio per landing.

Moved by: Phil Anderson                      Seconded by: Steve Williams  
Motion 16 carried unanimously.

**Motion 17:** Adopts April 1, 2014 to be the season start date for the incidental retention of halibut in the primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis.

Moved by: Phil Anderson                      Seconded by: Steve Williams  
Motion 17 carried unanimously.

**Motion 18:** Council to:  
1. Adopt the final Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan, including the process described in Section 1.3, except that the Council would consider Ecosystem matters during its March meeting and provide flexibility to the Ecosystem Plan

Development Team to consider and incorporate edits to the Plan as suggested by the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel (pages 3-5), HMS Management Team, and CPS Management Team for chapters 3, 4, and 6 (pages 1-2).

2. Adopt the final Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, and periodically revisit the Ecosystem Initiatives to revise, add to, or prioritize the list of initiatives in odd years, beginning with 2015.
3. Review and consider the List of Fisheries separately from the ecosystem Initiatives.
4. Move forward with Initiative 1, and form an ad hoc committee comprised of one representative from each of the following entities: NMFS Northwest Region; NMFS Southwest Region; coastal treaty tribes; states of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Representatives for this ad hoc committee could be forwarded to the Council Chair for appointment consideration.
5. Working from the flow chart on Figure A.1 on page A-8 and Table A.2 on page A-10 of the Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, the charge of the ad hoc committee would be to use this preliminary summary of select lower trophic level species in the CCE as an initial starting point to address the first four questions, and the following:
  - a. Build on the assessment, started by the EPDT, of the likelihood of fisheries developing to harvest those unmanaged species on the preliminary list—for example, consider whether these species are harvested elsewhere or whether markets exist for them; and
  - b. Brainstorm on whether there are general gear restrictions or prohibitions that could be used to restrict harvest of these unmanaged species; and
  - c. Develop recommendations for a proposed Council process for moving forward with Initiative 1 and identify next steps
  - d. Ad hoc committee would report back to the Council later this year with a more definitive timeline to be discussed under future Council agenda planning and workload (Agenda Item B.7)
6. As the Council moves forward with development and consideration of Amendment 24 to the Groundfish FMP, request the SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee consider how we might build upon this effort to move forward on Initiative 9 as another Council priority.

Moved by: Michele Culver  
Motion 18 carried unanimously.

Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

**Motion 19:** Council to:

1. Confirm that the primary focus of integration of EM into trawl catch share monitoring is to address compliance monitoring needs.

2. Adopt the regulatory objectives contained in the Agenda Item D.7.b EM Workshop report as modified by the recommendations in the Agenda Item D.7.d Supplemental GAP Report.

3. Direct the Council staff to work with federal and state agencies to develop a white paper that would identify monitoring performance standards and other requirements that EM proposals would have to meet.

4. Develop an initial scoping package that would include the strawman proposals contained in the EM Workshop reports as initial EM alternatives (splitting pot and longline as recommended in the Supplemental GAP Report), as well as an option of electronic monitoring participation agreements, the information resulting from the information requests in the report as available, and an initial list of the issues and tradeoffs that will need to be addressed.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman                      Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

**Amndmnt 1:** Delay the development of the initial scoping package until item 3 is completed; and, as part of the scoping package, the strawman proposals could be considered, but there might be things that come out of the whitepaper that could be different than those proposals.

Moved By: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln  
Amendment 1 carried unanimously.

**Amndmnt 2:** Strike the word “needs” and insert “to achieve individual accountability of catch and bycatch.”

Moved By: Dale Myer                              Seconded by: Michele Culver  
Amendment 2 carried unanimously. Motion 19, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 20:** Council to:

1. Forward the recommendations from the EM Workshop found on page vi of the Workshop report.
2. Request NMFS and PSMFC work together to determine what should be included in “total catch” for catch accounting purposes and provide this information to the Council as well to assure that consistent definitions are used during the 2013 study.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman                      Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

**Amndmnt 1:** Change item 2 by striking the original language and replace it with “PSMFC conform to the NFMS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting purposes in this study.”

Moved By: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Joanna Grebel  
Amendment 1 was not voted on.

**Amndmnt 2:** As a substitute to Amendment 1: for item two: *“Request PSMFC conform to NMFS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting for purposes of this study to the maximum extent practicable.”*

Moved By: Dave Hanson                      Seconded by: Herb Pollard  
Amendment 2 carried (Ms. Culver, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Lincoln voted no).  
Motion 20, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 21:** Council:

1. Move forward the process and schedule shown on page vii of the Workshop Report, recognizing that attainment of the schedule will be dependent on budget and workload considerations with the following changes: have the performance standards WP at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to September 2013. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.
2. Request that NMFS NW Region evaluate the implications on staff workload and ability to address other important trailing action needs should an out of cycle “EFP” avenue be explored to begin to allow testing EM usage without an observer prior to completion of the full regulatory package.
3. Explore the relative budget implications and other costs/benefits relative to having a workgroup be appointed with the characteristics described in recommendations of the GAP and the EC, or to have a subgroup of the GAP be tasked with the responsibilities that would be assigned to the workgroup.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman                      Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

**Amndmnt 1:** Under item 1, strike out *“have the performance standards WP at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to Sept 2013.”* Replace with *“whitepaper on performance standards considered in draft at the Sept 2013 meeting; finalized at November 2013 meeting. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.”*

Moved By: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Frank Lockhart

**Amdmnt 1a:** To strike *“Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to Nov 2015.”*

Moved By: Dale Myer                      Seconded by: Michele Culver  
Amendment 1a carried unanimously. Amendment 1, as amended, carried unanimously. Motion 21, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 22:** Adopt the inseason adjustments in the recommendations of WDFW (Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental WDFW Report, April 2013). Those recommendations are to adopt Federal regulations that conform with Washington recreational fisheries, specifically:

Between the U.S./Canada border and 48°10' N. lat. (Cape Alava) (Washington Marine Area 4):

1. Adopt a minimum size of 18 inches for cabezon and reduce the daily bag limit from two per angler per day to one per angler per day.
2. Reduce the minimum size limit for lingcod from 24 inches to 22 inches.

Moved By: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

Motion 22 carried unanimously.

**Motion 23:** Adopt the GAP recommendation shown in Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental GAP Report, April 2013, page 2. Those recommendations are to make changes to the trawl RCA boundaries north of 40°10' N. lat. to 48°10' N. lat. through the remainder of 2014 beginning in Period 6 of 2013. Specifically:

Period	Shoreward	Seaward
2013: Period 6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms
2014: Periods 1-6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms

Moved By: Dale Myer                      Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Motion 23 carried unanimously.

**Motion 24:** Adopt recommendations for further model runs and additional analyses as practicable, including those listed in the Supplemental CPSMT Report I.1.c, and the additional recommended analyses in the Supplemental CPSAS Report I.1.c with a priority regarding the Temperature-Recruitment Index, with the goal of providing a report in June.

Moved by: David Crabbe                      Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine

Motion 24 carried unanimously.

**Motion 25:** Adopt the following 2013 management structure for the Treaty Indian ocean salmon troll fisheries: The Treaty Indian ocean troll fishery would have a quota of:

- 52,500 Chinook
- 47,500 coho.

The overall chinook quota would be divided into a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota for the May 1 through June 30 Chinook only fishery and a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota



for the all species fishery in the time period of July 1 through September 15. The Treaty troll fishery would close upon the projected attainment of either of the Chinook or coho quota. Any Chinook remaining from the May/June Chinook only fishery may be transferred on an impact neutral basis to the July-September all species fishery. Other applicable regulations are shown in Table 3 of Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report: Analysis of Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures. April 10, 2013.

Moved by: David Sones                      Seconded by: Herb Pollard  
Motion 25 carried unanimously.

**Motion 26:** Adopt the season structures, size limits, quotas and other management measures for the commercial and recreational non-Indian fisheries North of Cape Falcon for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions. With the following modifications:

- Recreational fishery in the Neah Bay/La Push sub region – (Page 7) from the US/Can border to Queets River change “May 11-12” to “May 10-11”; and change “May 18-19” to “May 17-18.”

Moved by: Phil Anderson                      Seconded by: Steve Williams

**Amndmnt 1:** Add the following language: In Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d., second sentence to read: “*To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.*”

Moved By: Bob Turner                      Seconded by: Phil Anderson  
Amendment 1 carried unanimously.      Motion 26, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 27:** Adopt the management measures and quotas for the commercial and recreational non-Indian salmon fisheries from Cape Falcon south to the Oregon/California border as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report: “Analysis of Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures,” dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions.

Moved by: Steve Williams                      Seconded by: Jeff Feldner

**Amndmnt 1:** Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d, second sentence, to read: “*To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.*”

Moved By: Bob Turner    Seconded by: Herb Pollard  
Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 27, as amended, carried unanimously

**Motion 28:** Adopt the season structures, size limits, quotas, and other management measures for the commercial and recreational non-Indian fisheries from the OR/CA border to the US/Mexico border for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions, with the following modifications:

- For the commercial fishery in the OR/CA Border to Humboldt South Jetty (California KMZ) Area on page 2, modify the dates of July 1 through earlier of July 31 to July 15 through earlier of July 31.
- Include the following changes in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d., second sentence to read: To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.

Moved by: Marci Yaremko    Seconded by: David Crabbe  
Motion 28 carried unanimously.

**Motion 29:** Include consideration of the following comments on the reauthorization of the Magnuson Stevens Act, National Standards, and Regulations at the Managing our Nations Fisheries Conference 3 [the actual text for each bullet referred to in the motion has been added for ease of understanding]:

- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental SSC Report – Bullets numbered 2, 5 and 8:
  - § The rule that defines the maximum time for overfished stocks to rebuild,  $T_{MAX}$ , is discontinuous at 10 years. It should be replaced by a rule that is not discontinuous, such as “ $T_{MAX}$  is the larger of 10 years or the sum of  $T_{MIN}$  and one mean generation time.”
  - § “Overfished” and “overfishing” are currently defined as the same in the Act. The definitions of these terms should be changed to reflect actual practice when applying status determination criteria. “Overfished” is related to population size relative to the Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST) and “overfishing” is related to exploitation rates relative to the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold.
  - § The term “overfished” gives the impression that a stock is below the MSST because of excessive fishing. This is often not the case, so the term “overfished” should be replaced by one such as “depleted.”
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report, All of the items on the first page and the first item on page 2 without the last bullet:
  - § The integration of MSA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that Congress mandated in the last reauthorization of the statute still has not been implemented. And there currently appear to be some redundancies that remain between Council processes under MSA and NEPA. In short, NEPA and the MSA could likely be better-integrated—in

terms of process and environmental analysis—without reducing the quality of either. In addition, there are strong connections between the environmental questions NEPA raises and the analytical methods being advanced under ecosystem based fisheries management, as we have been raising under the Council’s consideration of Amendment 24 and ecosystem related agenda items (Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental GMT Report). Recognizing those connections and better integrating NEPA with MSA-focused analysis could be a way for Congress to support continued progress toward ecosystem based fisheries management and align staff and scientific resources with the highest conservation needs. The perception of many seems to be the opposite--i.e. that proposed changes to NEPA are necessarily motivated by a desire to pay less attention of environmental impacts and conservation.

§ We also think that Congress could learn from our west coast examples of rebuilding. Congress added the rebuilding provisions to the law in 1996 with certain policy goals in mind. Feedback from the Council’s experience could help Congress’ deliberations on whether those goals are being met. The results we have seen could be counter to expectations. For instance, with petrale sole the rebuilding projections showed the most long-term yield was expected by rebuilding using the standard  $F_{MSY}$  harvest rate, which was the slowest rebuilding alternative considered by the Council. This was counter to expectations and the widely held assumption that rebuilding “as short as possible” produces the most yield and economic benefit overall. In short, we believe Congress could change the law with a standard that more directly focuses on balancing the trade- off between short term economic consequences and long term yield and other impacts to the fishery and ecosystem without imposing overly formulaic constraints on the Councils.

§ Carryover in the Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) program is another area where questions about interpretations of the MSA have arisen. Consideration of carryover has been focused on the risk that issuing carryover might lead to an annual catch limit (ACL) overage despite everyone agreeing that such an overage would not raise a biological concern. More generally, this interpretation is one where we have questioned the emphasis of annual catch over the expected outcome over a multi-year period.

· Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GAP Report, on Page 1, the 1, 2, & 5 bullet, and the last bullet on Page 2:

§ Flexible Annual Catch Limits (ACL) management. The GAP is concerned that current ACL management is too stringent to accomplish the intent of optimum yield (OY) management. There is too much precaution in deciding the ACL specification. ACLs should be managed to better meet the goal of OY attainment, the socioeconomic objectives of the MSA, and to minimize fishery instability. The concept of long term averaging or multi-year ACLs will better enable implementation of the carry-over provisions in the fishery management plan (FMP). This conceptual change will have no biological consequence to our long-lived groundfish stocks.

- § Eliminate the 10-year rebuilding rule and provide more consideration of community needs for stocks that must be rebuilt in a longer time period. The 10-year rule, where stock rebuilding must occur within 10 years if possible, leads to an awkward and discontinuous policy that disrupts fisheries for little conservation gain. For example, if a stock can rebuild in 9.9 years but at a cost of closing all fisheries, this becomes a mandate even if the economic disruption is greatly lessened with an 11-year rebuilding plan. This is illogical and potentially disastrous for fishing-dependent communities.
- § Streamline the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and MSA processes. While the 2006 reauthorization of the MSA seemingly made streamlining the NEPA and MSA processes a mandate, NMFS has not addressed this. We still have an inefficient process where there are two administrative tracks to satisfy NEPA and MSA process mandates. This unnecessarily delays implementation of regulations and ties up NMFS and Council resources that could be used to make progress on other important initiatives. Specifically, it makes sense to use the regional fishery management council process, which is designed to engage the public before decisions are made, as a substitute to the notice and comment rulemaking required in the NEPA process. This would not compromise the quality of analysis required by NEPA. Council decisions are widely noticed to the public to solicit maximum input before decisions are made.
- § Maintain the positive aspects of the MSA. The GAP believes there are many mandates and aspects of the MSA that should not be changed. Decisions on allocation and on how to rationalize fisheries should continue to be made at the regional level and not be subject to top-down mandates. Catch share programs and formal allocations provide stability in fisheries management. National initiatives to sunset catch share programs or formal allocations are bad ideas. The aspects of the MSA establishing regional control in decision-making work very well and allow tailoring of fisheries management according to regional needs. Changing this aspect of the MSA will compromise the positive foundation of the MSA and will lead to disastrous consequences.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental CPSAS Report:
  - § Members of the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) discussed priorities for consideration in Magnuson Act (MSA) reauthorization discussions. Any changes to existing MSA mandates should be accompanied by full analysis of what appropriate funding levels need to be to carry out the intention of such mandates. These should include but not be limited to adequate research funding, for NOAA Fisheries-sponsored as well as cooperative research. In addition, regional fishery management council operations must be funded at appropriate levels to achieve the directives and objectives of the re-authorized MSA. We also emphasize the need to develop more collaborative research opportunities and collaborative management.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental HC Report: approve both, but in the second bullet replace “needs” with “should be”

- § Develop a new term, other than “overfishing,” for when a run is depressed for reasons not related to fishing; and for the “overfishing” reports required when a stock is “overfished” for three years in a row.
- § The HC agrees with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator Sam Rauch, in his comments to the House Committee on Natural Resources, that ecosystem, habitat, and climate change ~~needs~~ should be incorporated into stock assessments and management decisions.]

Moved by: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

**Amndmnt 1:** Add bullet 3 from the GAP Report to the list as shown on Page 1: Clarify rebuilding policy. There is an unwritten NMFS policy that once a rebuilding plan is adopted, it must be maintained until the biomass target is reached, even in the case when a new assessment representing the best available science indicates the stock was never overfished, or the stock is in the precautionary zone and subject to the harvest control rules in the FMP (e.g., the 40-10 rule). Changes in rebuilding rules could also clarify this policy.

Moved By: Steve Williams                      Seconded by: Jeff Feldner  
 Amendment 1 carried (Ms. Culver, Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Ortmann voted no).

**Amndmnt 2:** Add to the list of recommendations, the seventh bullet in Agenda Item B.4.d, Supplemental SSC report: The term “Ecosystem Component” should be defined more clearly.

Moved By: Marci Yaremko                      Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine  
 Amendment 2 carried (Mr. Ortmann, Ms. Lowman, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Myer, and Ms. Culver voted no).

**Amndmnt 3:** to strike “*NS, and regs.*” from the original motion.

Moved By: Rich Lincoln                      Seconded by: Dave Ortmann  
 Amendment 3 carried unanimously.      Motion 29, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 30:** Adopt Agenda Item B.4.b, Supplemental Legislative Committee Report, and strike “*Forage Fish*” from the header and replace with “*List of Fisheries.*”

Moved by: Ms. Yaremko                      Seconded by: David Crabbe

**Amndmnt 1:** strike “*Adopt*” and replace with “*accept.*”

Moved By: Rich Lincoln                      Seconded by: Michele Culver  
 Amendment 1 carried unanimously.      Motion 30, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 31:** Council accepts the recommendations contained in Agenda Item J.1.b, Supplemental EC Report.

Moved by: Steve Williams                      Seconded by: Michele Culver

**Amndmnt 1:** The EC also explore and discuss whether additional declarations for other fisheries need to be added to the list and bring their recommendations at the June Council meeting.

Moved By: Michele Culver                      Seconded by: Dorothy Lowman  
Amendment 1 carried unanimously.      Motion 31, as amended, carried unanimously.

**Motion 32:** Council to initiate the process to shift the start of the sardine fishery from January 1 to July 1 as recommended by the CPSMT (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSMT Report); the CPSAS (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSAS Report); and the SSC (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental SSC Report) with final action in June 2013. Direct the CPSMT to report at the June 2013 Council meeting with a proposed implementation process and schedule, and identify remaining considerations or issues.

Moved by: Steve Williams                      Seconded by: Michele Culver  
Motion 32 carried unanimously.

**Motion 33:** Approve as final, Agenda Item B.5.a, Attachment 1: Draft Minutes 216<sup>th</sup> Session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (November 2012).

Moved by: Dave Ortmann                      Seconded by: Herb Pollard

Motion 33 carried unanimously.

**Motion 34:** Appoint Dr. Tim Sippel to National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center Seat on the Highly Migratory Species Management Team, replacing Dr. Suzanne Kohin, and to appoint Dr. Ian Taylor to the National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center Seat on the Groundfish Management Team replacing Dr. Jason Kope.

Moved by Mark Helvey                      Seconded by: David Sones  
Motion 34 carried unanimously.